

May 28, 2009

Mr. Stephen Rushing, Chair  
Professional Educator Standards Board  
PO BOX 47200  
Olympia WA 98504

Dear Mr. Rushing,

It is my pleasure to write this letter sharing our involvement in reviewing the Lesley at Tacoma program. In short, we have discussed the new Standard V and implications for the program at every PEAB meeting since May 2007. During the first several meetings, we unpacked the standard and tried to build shared understanding. For example, in a particularly lengthy work session included the following discussion/comments:

- a. Several members comment on the need to hit the impact on student learning piece of the standard early and often in the practicum experience.
- b. One member also takes note of the new “aesthetic” language in the standard and wonders how this is addressed. Lesley faculty regard aesthetics as one of their strengths in all their programs. Board members present concurred.
- c. One member brings up the STEM questions guide on the OSPI website as a resource for candidates to link content to student learning (e.g., WASL performances) in instructional planning. The STEM questions are useful in integrating reading skills into content area coursework.
- d. Other board members describe additional resources accessible at OSPI and other sites. More specific discussion of these resources will occur at a later meeting.
- e. One member also asks about how candidates are prepared for building relational trust between educators, students, and parents. He recently read a study noting the importance of this trust in student achievement.

Most of our discussions and recommendations during the current academic year have related to student-based evidence and the accompanying field experiences. We worked with the program to ensure the assessment system aligns with the new standard and generates the necessary evidence. For example, we recommended that the program “should come up with a model that insures that students are trained in various assessments using student responses and includes such items as: know learning target/assess with a student-designed rubric/use a portfolio/collect data over time/include program improvement, but a model that also meets the needs of the program.”

In addition to reviewing Standard V, we reviewed the unit assessment system (Standard II) and candidate data as they became available. We examined the assessment gates, the key assessments at these gates, and the data that are available for these gates. We made appropriate recommendations regarding alignments and use of data for unit and program improvement.

The relationship between Lesley and the PEAB is and has always been collaborative and positive. Lesley genuinely respects and appreciates our discussions, the suggestions we make, and the formal recommendations that come from the PEAB. They respond to our recommendations in a meaningful and timely manner.

Sincerely,

Timothy Kopp, NBCT  
PEAB Chair